1 (Case called)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

2 MR. LENOW: Good morning, your Honor.

Jared Lenow for the government. With me at counsel table is Kelly Zovickian, a paralegal with our office.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. STERN: Good morning.

David Stern for Mr. Collymore.

THE COURT: Good morning.

First, I want to understand exactly what I have in front of me. I have a third superseding indictment. Was Mr. Collymore presented on each of the charges in the superseding indictment?

MR. LENOW: Judge, he just needs to be arraigned on the indictment. He's been presented before on charges related to the incident and bail conditions were set.

THE COURT: I'm sorry.

MR. STERN: Mr. Collymore has been presented in this case already. He just needs to be arraigned on the new charges in this indictment. This is the third indictment in this case.

THE COURT: Has he been presented on those new charges? Was he advised of those charges by a judge?

MR. LENOW: No, your Honor. Maybe it's a nomenclature issue, but --

THE COURT: He was originally brought in and advised of his rights. A determination was made as to whether counsel

1 | should be appointed.

2.3

MR. LENOW: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Was he advised by a judge of the charges and of his rights with respect to those charges?

MR. LENOW: No, he needs to be arraigned, your Honor. That's correct. What your Honor just went through is the process we need to go through this morning, the arraignment process.

THE COURT: What charges are new?

MR. LENOW: Your Honor, each of these counts has been brought before in another -- there has been a slight modification of the wording in these counts. Each count has been brought before. Out of abundance of caution, we think it would be advisable for the Court to arraign him on each of the charges in the S3 indictment.

THE COURT: I'm very confused. I hate to clutter up the record with this, but when you say he's been presented on each of the charges, but because there was some wording changes on each of them?

MR. LENOW: Your Honor, my explanation was definitely muddled. If I can just clarify.

What we're asking is that -- this is a brand-new charging instrument. We would appreciate if the Court -- we think it's necessary for the Court to arraign Mr. Collymore on this charging document, including each of the charges within

it. Perhaps we're just using a different phrasing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: I'm just going to do the whole thing, because it never hurts to do more.

MR. LENOW: Fair enough, Judge.

THE COURT: I'm sufficiently confused. In excess of caution, I'm just going to make sure Mr. Collymore understands his rights and understands each of these charges.

MR. LENOW: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Counsel, are you retained counsel or appointed counsel?

MR. STERN: Appointed.

THE COURT: CJA?

MR. STERN: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Collymore, the first thing I want to do is advise you of your rights.

You have the right to remain silent. You're not required to make any statements. Even if you have already made statements to the authorities, you need not make any further statements. Anything you do say can be used against you.

You do have the right to be represented by counsel during all court proceedings, including this one, also any questioning by the authorities. I understand you already have court-appointed counsel representing you here today.

The charges that you are facing in this third superseding indictment are, in the first count, a violation of

Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 1951, which makes it a crime to conspire with others to commit robbery, as that term is defined under federal law. More specifically, it's charged that you agreed with others to rob individuals who were engaged in the sale of marijuana at a location in the Bronx on or about April 28, 2016.

The second count charges you with a violation of Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 1951 and 2. More specifically, it's charged that you committed robbery that relates to the same events as Count One, Count One being the conspiracy charge.

In Count Three, it's charged that you had violated

Title 18 of the United States Code, Sections 924(c)(1)(A)(i),

(ii), (iii), and 2, which makes it a crime for a person to use

and carry a firearm during and in relation to a crime of

violence, specifically, attempted robbery, as charged in Count

Two -- I should have said Count Two was an attempted robbery -
in furtherance of that crime, to possess a firearm or aid and

abet the use, carrying, and possession of a firearm which was

brandished and discharged.

Count Four charges a violation of Title 18 of United States Code, Sections 924(j)(1) and (2), which makes it a crime for a person during and in relation to a crime of violence — again, the attempted robbery charged in Count Two of the indictment — to use and carry a firearm and, in furtherance of

Before I start with the plea, is there anything else that either counsel believes I should be going over with Mr. Collymore?

24

25

1 MR. LENOW: No, your Honor. Thank you.
2 MR. STERN: No.

2.3

THE COURT: Mr. Collymore, this indictment that I just referred to, the third superseding indictment, charges you with felony crimes.

You have a right to a trial on the charges before a United States District Judge. If you are found guilty, you will be sentenced by a United States District Judge.

Ordinarily, a defendant who wishes to enter a plea of guilty to these types of charges would do that before the district judge as well. That judge would then conduct the so-called plea allocution, which is the question-and-answer session which must accompany the entry of such a plea.

With a defendant's consent, however, a United States magistrate judge, such as myself, also has the authority to take a plea. If you were to consent to proceed before a magistrate for the purpose of entering the plea, you would receive all of the same procedural protections as you would receive if you were proceeding before the district judge.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Is it your wish to consent to proceed before a magistrate judge for the purpose of entering a plea?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I have a consent form that's been handed

MR. LENOW: Your Honor, I believe it would have been

THE DEFENDANT: I always had anxiety, so I had a hard

you were having any difficulties in school with learning or

anything, or were there other reasons?

2.3

24

25

1 | time focusing.

2.3

THE COURT: You had a hard time focusing because of anxiety?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you able to focus on these proceedings today in order to understand them fully?

THE DEFENDANT: Like, my problem with focusing is, like, when it comes to, like, reading and stuff, everything's just all over the place, and I can't pay attention to what's on the paper. So I always just run away, like, that's always been my problem.

MR. STERN: Judge, I think what we're going to do, with your permission, is I'm going to say the words to him and he'll say them, but he's read this with me and agrees these things are true.

THE COURT: We're not anywhere up to his stating what he did that makes him guilty of a crime. When we get to that point, we'll make accommodations, if necessary.

MR. STERN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Starting with the Consent Form to Proceed

Before a Magistrate Judge, which you said you've gone over with

your counsel, that's a relatively short form, but did you have

any difficulty reading or understanding that form?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Have you recently been under the care of a

1 doctor for any reason?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: How about a psychiatrist or a

psychologist?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: I spoke to this one, but briefly.

THE COURT: Same sort of issues that you already described, anxiety, or is there anything else that I should know about? Again, I'm looking for things that might affect your ability to participate fully today.

THE DEFENDANT: It's related to anxiety.

THE COURT: Do you take any medication?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Did you take your medication as necessary before today?

THE DEFENDANT: Last --

THE COURT: If you needed it.

THE DEFENDANT: Last night I took. I'm supposed to take them at night before bed.

THE COURT: You took it last night?

THE DEFENDANT: Correct.

THE COURT: Again, the reason I'm asking these questions is to make sure that you are able to participate fully in these proceedings today, that you understand what's going on, that you're able to participate voluntarily, with comprehension. If there's any problem, you'll let me know?

¹² Ease 91. 16-cr-00521-CM Document 57 Filed 02/20/18 Page 12 of 46 12 1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 2 THE COURT: Do you have any condition that affects 3 your ability to see or to hear? 4 THE DEFENDANT: I'm deaf in my right ear. 5 THE COURT: Can you hear me OK? THE DEFENDANT: 6 Yes. 7 THE COURT: Do you have any condition that affects 8 your ability to think or to reason or to understand or to make 9 decisions or judgments on your own behalf? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Well, with the anxiety it affects my 11 sometimes thinking. You know, in pressure moments it's really off, and I need to concentrate and focus on what's going on. I 12 13 tend to -- it's like adrenaline. 14 THE COURT: How are you doing with that right now? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Right now I'm OK. 16 THE COURT: Again, if you start to have any problems, 17 you have to let me know. 18 THE DEFENDANT: OK. 19 THE COURT: Because I have to make sure by the end of 20 this proceeding that you are able to function and think and 21 understand throughout the proceeding.

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: If you're not, you have to say something to your lawyer or say something to me.

THE DEFENDANT: OK.

THE DEFENDANT: OK.

1 THE COURT: Have you ever been treated for drug 2 addiction or alcoholism? 3 THE DEFENDANT: No. 4 THE COURT: As you appear before me, are you under the influence of any kind of drugs or alcohol or medication? 5 THE DEFENDANT: No. 6 7 THE COURT: Is your mind clear? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 9 THE COURT: Do you generally feel all right today? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Do you have any trouble understanding the 11 12 questions I'm asking you? 13 THE DEFENDANT: No. 14 THE COURT: Have you received a copy of the third 15 superseding indictment in this case? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Have you had a chance to read it or do you 18 want me to take the time to read it to you? 19 THE DEFENDANT: No, you don't have to. 20 THE COURT: I'm sorry? 21 THE DEFENDANT: You do not have to read it. 22 THE COURT: I do not have to read it. 2.3 With respect to that document and going through it, 24 did you have any difficulties focusing or understanding what

25

was in the indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Along with my lawyer we went through it, so I understand.

THE COURT: OK. You understand what it says you did?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you had enough time to talk to your attorney about the charges and about how you wish to plead?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

2.3

THE COURT: Are you satisfied with the representation and advice given to you by your attorney? If you have any hesitation, you have to tell me.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I thought I could get something better than that, but I was told there's no way, so I guess my back's against the wall.

THE COURT: Do you feel comfortable enough with the advice that you've received that you feel prepared to go forward today, or do you feel that you are not confident regarding the advice and representation you've received and perhaps you should not go forward today?

You have to be honest with me.

THE DEFENDANT: I really wanted more time, but I was told that today I go to trial on Tuesday.

THE COURT: Is this case scheduled for trial on Tuesday?

MR. LENOW: Yes, your Honor. The case is scheduled to commence first thing in the morning on Tuesday before Judge

12 Ease 91.16-cr-00521-CM Document 57 Filed 02/20/18 Page 15 of 46

1 McMahon.

2.3

To follow up on the colloquy that your Honor just had, we've had a conversation with defense counsel. The government has not extended a plea offer. We will not be extending a plea offer. There will be no other offer, no offer made.

Here, the defendant is pleading to the indictment pursuant to a Pimentel letter, and there will be no plea offer forthcoming. As Mr. Collymore did state, this is the situation he finds himself in or he will proceed to trial on Tuesday, and no formal plea offer has been made and none will be made.

THE COURT: I don't want you to come back later,

Mr. Collymore, and say that your lawyer did not fully inform

you of your options; that he was in some manner not giving you

fair, meaningful, effective representation. I want you to feel

confident with the representation you've received as you go

forward with the plea.

If you're not confident, I will try to find someone else to at least consult with you today. I'm not saying that I'm going to substitute somebody else as a different lawyer, but I will let you consult with someone else to make sure you've had a full opportunity to feel confident in the path that you're saying. But if you're going to trial on Tuesday, you're going to trial on Tuesday. I can't control Judge McMahon's schedule. Your lawyer can ask to have it put off. She may say yes, she may say no.

Are there other defendants in the case that would go to trial?

MR. LENOW: It's just Mr. Collymore.

Judge McMahon's chambers has informed us there will not be a change in the trial date; that it will be going forward on Tuesday.

THE COURT: Was there a request for the change?

MR. LENOW: There have been two prior adjournments. This will be the third trial date we've had. Judge McMahon's chambers has informed us that it's a firm trial date and will be commencing trial on Tuesday.

THE COURT: It sounds like the case is going to go to trial on Tuesday, unless you decide to plead. As I've explained to you, you have every right to go to trial if you wish. You do not have to plead. I'll go through with you what rights you would have at trial and what the circumstances of a plea would be and so on. That's part of what I'm here to do today, but it doesn't sound like there will be more time to consider it.

The most I can do is see if I can find another attorney to consult with you for a short time and, if you decide you still want to plead, put you back on my calendar today a little bit later. My calendar is pretty full, but I will do my best to accommodate you, if that's what you want. I just want to make sure you're comfortable going forward today

1

What do you want to do?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 2.3

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: I would like the opportunity to talk to someone else.

THE COURT: We are going to check and see who the CJA attorney is who is on duty today. I don't know if there's a conflict. Is there likely to be a conflict with anyone?

MR. LENOW: Your Honor, I'm happy to consult with the clerk's office and make sure there's a conflict-free counsel that is available.

THE COURT: I understand the CJA on duty today is running late due to health issues, so everything may get thrown into some turmoil.

You should also know that I have pleas scheduled in this courtroom this morning. This was supposed to be 10:00. I have 10:30, 11:00, 11:30, and a 2:30 arraignment, followed by a bail hearing. So it will be tight, but I'll accommodate you. We'll figure it out.

I'm going to ask counsel, if you need to make yourselves available, do you have other commitments in the court later today?

MR. LENOW: I do, Judge, but I'm sure we'll be able to accommodate the Court's preferred schedule. We'll find a way to make it happen.

THE COURT: Just a moment. Let's go off the record so

that the government can check with respect to CJA roster and see who's conflict-free. We'll reconvene after we figure that piece out.

Off the record.

(Recess)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}.$ LENOW: Your Honor, Jared Lenow and Hagan Scotten with the government.

With me at counsel table is Kelly Zovickian, a paralegal at our office.

MR. STERN: David Stern for Mr. Collymore.

THE COURT: We broke earlier at -- what time was that, counsel?

MR. LENOW: Around 10:30, I think, Judge. 10:30, 10:45.

THE COURT: Approximately 10:30 or thereabouts. It's now quarter to one.

In the interim, Natali Todd, who is also on the CJA panel, was good enough to speak with Mr. Collymore and give him some independent counsel.

I gather you're all back again. Ms. Todd is here.

MS. TODD: Good afternoon, your Honor. Natali Todd.

THE COURT: I gather Mr. Collymore is prepared to go forward with the plea; is that right?

MS. TODD: That's correct, your Honor.

I had a conversation with Mr. Collymore, I think, by

2.3

my watch, maybe 40, 45 minutes, to discuss his intention to plead or not plead guilty, and whether or not he had any issues with his lawyer and conflict, was he not satisfied, was he confused about the plea.

Mr. Collymore assured me, after I had gone through potential conflicts with him, what that would look like, and he assured me that he was quite happy with Mr. Stern; that he did wish to proceed with the plea today; and he understood what the guideline calculations were, what the possible maximum sentences and minimum sentences were. I explained how that might play out at sentencing and all the relevant factors, any medical issues, if that applies, his personal history and characteristics, as 3553(a) dictates, and that all that would be relevant at sentencing.

I believe he understood. He tells me that he's prepared to go forward and he's satisfied with his counsel, but the Court should inquire of him directly, just to be clear.

THE COURT: Mr. Collymore, I'm hoping that was helpful to you in having a chance to speak with Ms. Todd?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it was.

THE COURT: After hearing from her, are you now satisfied with the representation and advice that you've received from Mr. Stern?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you prepared to go forward with your

12 Ease 91. 12-cr-00521-CM Document 57 Filed 02/20/18 Page 20 of 46

1 | plea without questions about the adequacy of your counsel?

2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Todd, I'm going to thank you for your assistance in this case. I know you have to be somewhere, so I'll let you go where you need to go.

MS. TODD: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Collymore, are you ready to enter a plea?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: There are four counts, as you know, of the third superseding indictment. I'm going to go through them one at a time and I'm going to ask with respect to each how you wish to plead, guilty or not guilty.

Count One, as I noted earlier, charges you with participating in a conspiracy to commit robbery under the law that's known as the Hobbs Act, federal law, on or about April 28, 2016, in violation of Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 1951.

How do you wish to plead to that count, guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: Count Two charges you with attempted robbery on that same date in violation, again, of Title 18 of United States Code, Section 1951.

How do you wish to plead to that count?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

2.3

THE COURT: Count Three charges you with using, brandishing, and discharging a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence, specifically the attempted robbery that's charged in Count Two.

How do you wish to plead to that charge?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: Finally, Count Four charges you with using a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence, again, in the attempted robbery charged in Count Two, and thereby causing the death of a person, which killing constitutes murder, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 924(j)(1) and (2).

How do you wish to plead to that charge?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: I neglected to say Count Three was in violation of Title 18 of U.S. Code, Sections 924(c)(1)(a)(i), (iii), (iii), and 2.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Because you are proposing to enter a guilty plea to each of these charges, I have to ask you some additional questions to be sure that you understand the nature of the charges against you and the consequences of your plea and also to ensure that your plea is voluntary.

12 E 4 6 - cr-00521-CM Document 57 Filed 02/20/18 Page 22 of 46

2.3

First, I want you to understand that if you are convicted of the charge in Count One, that's the robbery conspiracy charge, you can face, on that count alone, a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment, a maximum term of supervised release of three years, a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross pecuniary gain or monetary gain that you derived from the offense, or twice the gross pecuniary loss to persons other than yourself resulting from the offense, as well as a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

Do you understand all of that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand if convicted on the second count, that's the attempted robbery charge, standing alone, you can face on that count a maximum sentence of 20 years' imprisonment; a maximum term of supervised release of three years; a maximum fine of, again, the greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross pecuniary gain or loss resulting from the offense; and again, a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if convicted of the third count, which is the first of the two firearm charges, you could face, on that count alone, a maximum sentence of life

imprisonment; a mandatory minimum term of 25 years' 1 2 imprisonment, which must run consecutively to any other 3 sentence imposed upon you, including the sentences imposed for 4 other counts of this indictment; a maximum fine, again, at the 5 greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross pecuniary gain or loss 6 resulting from the offense -- and I neglected to say, as well, 7 a maximum term of supervised release of five years; and a 8 mandatory special assessment of \$100.

Do you understand all of that?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you are convicted of the fourth count, standing alone, that's the second of the firearm charges against you, the one that involves the killing of a person, that charge, standing alone, would carry with it a maximum sentence of life imprisonment, a mandatory minimum sentence of five years' imprisonment, which must run consecutively to any other sentence imposed on you, including the sentence for any other count of the indictment; a maximum term of supervised release of five years; a fine in, again, the greatest amount of \$250,000 or twice the gross pecuniary gain or loss resulting from the offense; and again a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

Do you understand all of that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if convicted of all

of these counts, the total maximum sentence of incarceration that you could face would be life imprisonment, with a mandatory minimum term of imprisonment of 30 years, which must be imposed to run consecutively to any other sentence, including any other sentence imposed on this same indictment?

Do you understand that?

2.3

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that, if convicted of these crimes, the Court may order you to pay restitution to any victims of the crimes?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that if you are convicted, you could be required to forfeit all property, real and personal, that constitutes or derives from proceeds traceable to your crimes?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that if, as part of your sentence, you are placed on a term of supervised release, and you then violate any condition of that release, your supervised release may be revoked and you may face an additional term of imprisonment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if that should happen, you may not get credit for time served on supervised release? In other words, the Court could require you to serve

in prison all or part of the term of supervised release that's authorized by law for these offenses, without giving you credit for time you may have already serve on supervised release.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

2.3

THE COURT: Do you understand that you have a right to plead not guilty to these charges, and the right to a speedy and public trial, and a jury trial, if you wish?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you previously entered a plea of not guilty to these charges, no one is requiring you to change your plea and to proceed on a guilty plea?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you were to go to trial, the burden would be on the government to prove your guilt by competent evidence beyond a reasonable doubt?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you were going to go to trial, you would be presumed to be innocent unless and until the government did prove your guilt beyond a reasonable doubt?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand if you were to go to trial by jury, a jury composed of 12 people selected from this district would have to agree unanimously that you are guilty?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: Do you understand that at a trial you would be entitled to be represented by an attorney at all stages, and if you could not afford to hire one, an attorney would be provided to you free of charge?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that your right to be represented by counsel and, if necessary, to have the court-appoint counsel for you, applies not only to trial, but also to every other stage of the proceedings against you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that at a trial you would be entitled, through your attorney, to cross-examine any witnesses called by the government to testify against you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that at a trial, you would be entitled to testify and to present evidence on your own behalf?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that this means that you would have the right to call witnesses to testify on your behalf?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that you would be entitled to have the Court issue subpoenas to compel witnesses

12 E 2 6 9 1 f 6 - cr - 00521 - CM Document 57 Filed 02/20/18 Page 27 of 46

1 | to appear to testify at trial?

2.3

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand at a trial you would not be required to incriminate yourself; that is, you would not be required to testify against yourself?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that this means that at a trial you would have the right to testify if you wanted to do so, but no one could force you to testify if you did not want to do so; furthermore, no inference or suggestion of guilt could be drawn if you chose not to testify at trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you go forward with your guilty plea, you will be giving up all the types of protections I've just described, including your very right to a trial, and the only remaining step would be the imposition of sentence by the district judge in this case, who is Judge McMahon?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if any of the answers that you give me today prove to be untruthful, you could face a separate prosecution for perjury or for making a false statement to the Court?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You told me earlier that you were not a

United States citizen; is that correct? You're a citizen of Trinidad and Tobago?

THE DEFENDANT: That is correct.

2.3

THE COURT: Do you understand that pleading guilty could subject you to deportation?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that in the circumstances of your case, deportation may be mandatory?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You also understand that as a result of your plea and the conviction that may flow from that, that you may not only be removed from the United States, but you may be denied readmission to the United States in the future and also denied citizenship?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: In light of everything I have now told you, do you still wish to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the decision as to the appropriate sentence in your case will be entirely up to Judge McMahon?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that Judge McMahon will have discretion in determining your sentence, and her discretion will be limited only by what the law requires for

12 E 2 6 9 1 2 6 - cr - 00521 - CM Document 57 Filed 02/20/18 Page 29 of 46

1 | these particularly charged offenses?

2.3

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that with respect to your sentence, the Court will have the authority to impose an order of restitution, as I mentioned, and the obligation to impose a special assessment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that in determining your sentence, the Court will also have the obligation to calculate the sentencing guidelines and to consider them, even though it will not be required to sentence you within the guidelines range?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you and your attorney had a chance to talk about how the guidelines may be calculated in your case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the Court will not be able to determine the guidelines for your case until a presentence report has been completed, and both you and the government have had the chance to challenge the facts that are reported to the probation officer?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that even after the guidelines calculation has been made for a case, the sentencing judge will have the authority to impose a sentence that is

either less severe or more severe than the sentence recommended by the guidelines, as long as it's within the statutory maximum for the charged crimes?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

2.3

THE COURT: Do you understand that in addition to considering the sentencing guidelines, the Court will also have to consider possible departures from the guidelines, and also a number of different factors on deciding on the appropriate sentence to impose in your case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you and counsel had the chance to talk about the various factors listed in the relevant provision of law, that's Title 18 of United States Code, Section 3553(a), and about how those different factors may apply to you in your particular case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you need a moment to confer?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Do you understand that those factors include, but are not limited to, the actual conduct in which you engaged, the victim of the offense, the role you played in the offense, whether or not you have accepted responsibility for your acts, whether you have any criminal history, and whether you have engaged in any obstruction of justice?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that even if you end up shocked and disappointed by your sentence, you will still be bound by your guilty plea?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: Do you understand that under some circumstances, you or the government may have the right to appeal the sentence that is imposed?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that there is no parole in the federal system, and that if you are sentenced to prison, you will not be released on parole?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Understanding everything I've just told you, do you still wish to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I should clarify, with respect to my question about your appeal right, if there's no plea agreement here with an appeal waiver, I shouldn't qualify it by saying "under some circumstances." You understand you would have the right to appeal from your sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I have a copy of a letter from the government dated February 14, 2018, to your counsel.

Have you seen this letter from the government?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the government's letter is not a plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

2.3

THE COURT: Do you understand that the purpose of the government's letter is to set forth for you its current position as to how it believes the guidelines would be calculated in your case, the sentencing guidelines?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that based on information currently known to the government, it is its position that, based on the calculations set out in its letter, the sentencing guidelines range on Counts One, Two, and Four of the indictment would be 360 months to life imprisonment; that Count Three requires a mandatory minimum of 300 months' imprisonment to be imposed independently of the sentence on all other counts; and therefore, the guidelines range on Counts One through Four is 360 months to life imprisonment, with a mandatory minimum of 360 months imprisonment.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Off the record for a second.

(Off-the-record discussion)

THE COURT: Let's go back on the record.

When we were off the record, I inquired of the government regarding its guidelines calculation in its Pimentel

letter, in light of the fact that both Counts Three and Four include a mandatory minimum term of imprisonment that would have to run consecutively to any other sentence. What's stated in the Pimentel letter in terms of a mandatory consecutive sentence was only with respect to Count Three. So I just wanted some clarification on that.

MR. SCOTTEN: Specifically, with respect to the guidelines range, the guidelines work differently for Count Three, which is 924(c), discharge of a firearm, and Count Four, which is 924(j), essentially murder using a firearm in a crime of violence.

For 924(j), the guidelines are the murder guidelines, and so the defendant's guidelines on that are 360 months to life. The 924(j) count by itself only has a five-year mandatory minimum in it, so that is subsumed within the 360 months to life; that is, essentially the sentence he gets for the 924(j) under the guidelines would be 360 months to life.

924(c) works differently. It's a separate guidelines provision. Under that provision, you take the mandatory minimum for the 924(c) and you add it to all of the other guidelines calculations.

In this case, because the 924(c) is successor to the (j), the mandatory minimum just for the (c) is 300 months. So you add that to the guidelines for all the other counts, which is why you get 360, plus 300 months. There's no requirement

for the (j) if you add that five years on top, because it's already included as guidelines. So it doesn't add even higher guidelines as a result of the (j).

Does that parse it out?

2.3

THE COURT: I appreciate that.

MR. SCOTTEN: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me go back to what I was saying before, Mr. Collymore, and I'm assuming you've been listening to what the government said as well.

Do you understand it is the government's current position that if the guidelines were applied in your case, you could expect the range of a prison term to be from 660 months to life imprisonment, with a mandatory minimum of 360 months?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that it is the government's current position that, under the guidelines, if it were applied, the range for a fine in your case would be anywhere from \$50,000 to \$500,000?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that nothing in the government's letter can bind Judge McMahon with respect to a guidelines calculation, and that she will do her own guidelines calculation, which may be different from the ones stated in the government's letter?

THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me. Say that again.

2.3

THE COURT: Do you understand that this is the government's position; it's not necessarily the Court's position? Judge McMahon, prior to her sentencing, will do her own guidelines calculation, which may be the same as what the government has set forth, but it may be different.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that nothing in the government's letter can, in any way, bind the Court with respect to the sentence that it imposes?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the calculation contained in the government's letter is based on information currently known to the government; and that nothing in its letter will limit the right of the government to change its position at any time as to the appropriate guidelines calculation in your case to present to the Court or the probation office, and all facts relevant to your sentencing or to seek a departure or variance from the guidelines, or to take a position with respect to any departure or guidelines that may be suggested by the Court, by the probation office, or by you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand the government is not making you any promise as to the sentence that you will

1 | receive?

2.3

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Has anyone made any promises of any kind to you to influence you to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have any promises been made to you regarding the sentence that you will receive?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that no one, including your attorney or the government or this Court, can give you any assurance as to what your sentence will be, as your sentence will be determined solely by the sentencing judge after that judge has ruled on any challenges to the presentence report, has calculated the sentencing guidelines, and has determined whether there are grounds to adjust the guidelines range or to sentence you outside of that range?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I just note that there seems to be a paragraph in the Pimentel letter as to something that defendant is recognizing with respect to immigration consequences at the bottom of page 4. This is solely the government's letter. I'm not sure why that's there.

MR. SCOTTEN: I think that's fair, your Honor. It's stock language. It would be more accurately phrased as a warning to the defendant, but the defendant does not have to

recognize anything. Of course if the defendant doesn't agree to the Pimentel, it doesn't really matter that it says that, because, as you point out, the defendant hasn't agreed to it.

THE COURT: I have already sought to make sure that Mr. Collymore understands what the potential immigration consequences are of his plea, and I don't believe I need to do more on that.

Does the government agree?

MR. SCOTTEN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have any threats been made against you,

Mr. Collymore, either direct or indirect, to influence how you
plead today?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is your plea voluntary and made of your own free will?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Before I ask you to explain what you did, let me ask the government please to summarize the elements it would need to establish at trial to sustain each of the four charges.

MR. LENOW: Your Honor, on Count One, first, the government would have to prove that two or more individuals agreed to take personal property from the premise of another; second, that this was done by force or threat of force; and third, that this had an effect or would have an effect on

12 Ease 1.16-cr-00521-CM Document 57 Filed 02/20/18 Page 38 of 46

interstate commerce had the agreement come to fruition.

Count Two. The elements are that an individual took a substantial step towards completing a robbery, that is, the taking of permanent property from the premise of another. This was done by force or threat of force or would have involved those had the attempt come to -- I'm sorry, and do involve those.

THE COURT: I'm assuming that defendant took the substantial step.

MR. LENOW: Yes, the defendant took that substantial step to take personal property from the premise of another by force or threat of a force, and that this would have had an effect on interstate commerce or did have an effect on interstate commerce if the robbery had come to fruition.

The third count would be the firearm count. It involves four elements.

The first is that during and in relation to the commission of a crime of violence prosecutable in federal court, here, that's the attempt to commit robbery charged in Count Two, the defendant knowingly used, possessed, or carried a firearm. This use, possession, or carrying of a firearm was in furtherance of a crime of violence, that's the predicate offense. Fourth, the firearm was discharged and, here, specifically alleged that that discharge was on an occasion other than the death of Carlos Vargas.

The fourth count here is the firearm count involving the death of Carlos Vargas. The elements there are, first, during and in relation to the commission of a crime of violence prosecutable in federal court, the attempt to commit robbery charged in Count Two, the defendant knowingly used, possessed, or carried a firearm. That use, possession, or carrying of a firearm was in furtherance of the crime of violence charged; that this caused the death of another person through the use of a firearm, here Carlos Vargas. Finally, that the killing would be defined as murder under federal law.

With respect to each of these counts, the government would have to prove by a preponderance of evidence that some act, either the conspiracy or the agreement, was formed in or was carried out in the Southern District of New York and, with the other counts, that some act in furtherance of the crime occurred in the Southern District of New York as well.

I would also note, while I have the chance to address the Court, that we also want to note that consular notification in this case was made back when the defendant was arrested back in August of 2016.

THE COURT: Thank you for following up on that.

Can I just quickly ask for clarification on the one date, April 28, 2016, the use or carrying of a firearm for some purpose other than the alleged murder, on occasions other than that murder and then for that. Can I just get a quick

12 Case 91.16-cr-00521-CM Document 57 Filed 02/20/18 Page 40 of 46

understanding from the government as to what facts you'd be looking for that would satisfy both of those things?

MR. LENOW: Of course, your Honor.

2.3

With respect to Count Four, which is the death count, that offense is specifically defined by another person dying by virtue of the use of a firearm. So in this case the evidence would show that the defendant at a point in time pointed a gun at someone and discharged it and that bullet caused the person to die.

There was, however, another shooting that occurred in that apartment that was not the murder. Another victim of the robbery was fired at. The bullet fortunately missed that person, so that is the separate conduct. Essentially the attempted murder is the conduct that underlies Count Three. The murder, the firing of a firearm that actually killed an individual, just a separate shooting, is the conduct that underlies Count Four.

THE COURT: I see.

Mr. Collymore, did you hear counsel for the government summarize the elements that it would need to prove as to each of the charges in order to obtain a conviction against you on each of those separate charges?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that in order to obtain a conviction against you on any particular charge, the

government would have to prove each of the elements of that offense beyond a reasonable doubt?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you still wish to proceed with your plea?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: Did you, in fact, commit the four offenses that are charged in the third superseding indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Would you tell us in your own words what you did that makes you guilty of these crimes?

MR. STERN: Judge, with your permission, these are his words that he intends to use, but he's going to have trouble reading them, so I'm going to read them and he's going to repeat it, but they are, in fact, his words.

THE COURT: Mr. Collymore, I'm going to ask you to confirm to me, after you give me this information, that these are, in fact, your own words and not the words of counsel. All right? Go ahead. You may proceed in this way.

THE DEFENDANT: On April 28, 2016 --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. April 28; is that right?

MR. STERN: 28.

THE DEFENDANT: In the Southern District of New York,

I agreed with others to commit robbery. We agreed to rob

people engaged in the sale of marijuana at 22466 Marion

1 | Avenue -- 2466 Marion Avenue.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

THE COURT: 2466 Marion Avenue. That's in the Bronx;
is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

On that same day, I, along with others, tried to rob the spot at 2466 Marion Avenue.

During the robbery, I possessed, brandished, and discharged --

THE COURT: Possessed, brandished, and discharged; is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Correct.

A gun, which I fired at someone other than Carlos Vargas.

THE COURT: Let me make sure I have the name properly.

MR. STERN: Carlos Vargas.

THE COURT: Carlos Vargas.

THE DEFENDANT: That same day I used a weapon, a firearm, and killed Carlos Vargas.

THE COURT: Let me make sure that I'm following everything.

You agreed with other people that you would either rob or certainly try to rob people engaged in the sale of marijuana. I got that much correct, right?

THE DEFENDANT: Correct.

THE COURT: Then you went ahead in accordance with

12 5 12 6 12 6 - cr-00521 - CM Document 57 Filed 02/20/18 Page 43 of 46

that agreement to try to commit that robbery, right?

2 THE DEFENDANT: That's correct.

3 | THE COURT: In the Bronx.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

In connection with that robbery, am I right in understanding that you possessed a firearm, and that you took out that firearm and, in fact, shot it at two people?

THE DEFENDANT: That's correct.

THE COURT: One of the people was Carlos Vargas, and he died from that shooting; is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You also shot at someone else who was not hit by a bullet; is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: That's correct.

THE COURT: Did you understand what it was you were doing when you agreed to try to commit this robbery? Did you understand that's what you were agreeing to do?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All of this use of a gun, am I right in understanding that was all in furtherance of trying to rob these drug dealers; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: That's correct.

THE COURT: The words that you spoke to me, with the assistance of your counsel, were those your own words?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do either counsel believe that any

additional facts need to be elicited for a satisfactory allocution to any of the counts?

MR. LENOW: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Counsel?

MR. STERN: No.

2.3

THE COURT: Do either counsel believe there are any additional questions of any kind that should be asked of Mr. Collymore?

MR. LENOW: No, your Honor.

MR. STERN: No.

THE COURT: Do either counsel know of any reason I should not recommend that Judge McMahon accept this plea?

MR. LENOW: No, your Honor.

MR. STERN: I do not.

THE COURT: Then based on my colloquy with Mr. Collymore, I conclude that he understands the nature of the four charges in the third superseding indictment, and the consequences of his plea to those charges. I am also satisfied that his plea is voluntary and there is a factual basis for the plea.

I'll also note for the record that I see no issue with respect to Mr. Collymore's competence to enter a plea. He seemed fully able to participate in these proceedings today.

As has already been noted on the record earlier, when he expressed hesitation previously about proceeding, we did

take a fairly substantial break and retained another attorney to consult with him. I'm satisfied with his response that he was then comfortable with going forward.

Accordingly, for all these reasons, I recommend that Judge McMahon accept the proffered plea to the four counts of the indictment in 16 Cr. 521.

Has Judge McMahon set a sentencing date?

MR. LENOW: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's have a control date 90 days out.

May 16. Please be in touch with Judge McMahon's chambers about that.

Is there any issue here as to bail?

MR. STERN: No.

2.3

THE COURT: I'm going to ask the government to prepare the prosecution case summary for the purposes of the presentence report, and to deliver that to the probation department no later than two weeks from today.

I'm also going to ask defense counsel to contact the probation department to schedule a presentence interview of your client, also to be held within two weeks. Please make yourself available for that interview so that the matter can be moved along.

Counsel, I assume the government will order a copy of the transcript of this allocution?

MR. LENOW: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Please submit that, together with any necessary additional paperwork, to Judge McMahon so that she may act on my recommendation. Is there anything else? MR. LENOW: No, your Honor. Thank you for your time. MR. STERN: Not from us. Thank you. THE COURT: Best of luck to you, Mr. Collymore. (Adjourned)